UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

TS,

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/976,579	11/24/97	THORNTON J	JAD-34191

LM01/0706

OLIFF & BERRIDGE
P O BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA VA 22320

EXAMINER
TUCKER,C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2766	7

DATE MAILED: 07/06/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Offic Action Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)	
	08/976,579	THORNTON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher M. Tucker	2766	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with th correspondence address --

Peri d f r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 April 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disp sition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:

1.☐ received.

2.☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____ .

3.☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
20) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. The rejection of claims 1-27 as either being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Smith (U.S. 5,181,162) are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamming et al. (hereinafter, "Lamming") (U.S. 5,862,321) in view of Zdybel, Jr. et al. (hereinafter, "Zdybel") (U.S. 5,486,686).

4. As per claims 1 and 10, Lamming discloses a system and method for accessing and distributing electronic documents, comprising:

a token generator that generates tokens relating to at least one other document, the other document being an electronic document, for the purpose of linking the other document (fig. 1 and associated text, especially column 4, line 40 – column 5, line 28); and

an encoder that encodes the generated tokens (fig. 1 and associated text, especially column 4, line 40 – column 5, line 28).

Lamming does not disclose a printer that prints the encoded tokens onto a paper document.

Zdybel discloses an electronic document processing system for printing unfiltered or filtered (i.e., complete or partial, uncompressed or compressed) machine readable digital

representations of electronic documents and human readable renders of them on the same recording media using the same printing process (see summary). Zdybel further discloses that the machine readable digital representations of electronic documents can be encodes glyphs (column 8, line 30 – column 9, line 12) and that the glyph encoded data may include at least machine readable descriptions of hypertext pointer values (column 10, lines 13-27). So, Zdybel discloses linking other electronic documents on a printed media through the use of glyphs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lamming to print the encoded tokens onto a paper document by incorporating the teachings of Zdybel because paper documents are still a primary medium for written communications and for record keeping (Zdybel: column 3, lines 3-4).

5. As per claims 2 and 11, Lamming does not disclose that an electronic scanner reads the encoded tokens. However, Zdybel discloses a scanner for scanning the glyph-encoded data (figs. 3 & 4 and associated text, especially column 9, lines 46-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lamming to utilize an electronic scanner that reads the encoded tokens by incorporating the teachings of Zdybel because paper documents are still a primary medium for written communications and for record keeping (Zdybel: column 3, lines 3-4).

6. As per claims 3 and 12, Lamming does not disclose a processor that recognizes the scanned tokens. However, Zdybel discloses a processor that recognizes the scanned glyphs (figs. 3 & 4 and associated text, especially column 9, lines 46-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lamming to utilize a process that recognizes the scanned tokens by incorporating the teachings of Zdybel

because paper documents are still a primary medium for written communications and for record keeping (Zdybel: column 3, lines 3-4).

7. As per claims 4 and 13, Lamming does not explicitly disclose that the processor retrieves an electronic document based on the recognized tokens. However, Zdybel discloses that the processor retrieves an electronic document based on the recognized glyphs (figs. 3 & 4 and associated text, especially column 9, lines 46-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lamming to have the processor retrieve an electronic document based on the recognized tokens by incorporating the teachings of Zdybel because paper documents are still a primary medium for written communications and for record keeping (Zdybel: column 3, lines 3-4).

8. As per claims 5 and 14, Lamming does not disclose that the printer prints human-readable identifies relating to the tokens printed on the paper document. However, Zdybel discloses that the printer prints human-readable identifiers relating to the glyphs printed on the paper document (column 4, lines 45-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lamming to have the printer print human-readable identifies relating to the tokens printed on the paper document by incorporating the teachings of Zdybel because paper documents are still a primary medium for written communications and for record keeping (Zdybel: column 3, lines 3-4).

9. As per claims 6 and 15, Lamming discloses a memory that stores generated tokens (columns 4 & 5).

10. As per claims 7 and 16, Lamming discloses that the encoder encodes information relating to the owner of the document (column 4, line 40 – column 5, line 17; columns 7-10).

11. As per claims 8 and 17, Lamming discloses encrypting the tokens (column 10, line 56 – column 11, line 5).

12. As per claims 9 and 18, Lamming does not explicitly disclose generating tokens containing authentication information. However, Zdybel discloses encoding information, which is computed from the content of the document and other information for purposes of authentication and verification of document integrity and for computation purposes (column 5, lines 2-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lamming to disclose generating tokens containing authentication information by incorporating the teachings of Zdybel for purposes of authentication and verification of document integrity and for computation purposes (column 5, lines 2-6).

13. Claims 19-27 recite the method corresponding to the system claims 1-18. Since no further limitations are claimed, claims 19-27 are thus rejected.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher M. Tucker whose telephone number is 703 306 5539. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F between the hours of 8:30 and 4:30 with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gail O. Hayes can be reached on 703 305 9711. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305 0040 for regular communications and 703 305 0040 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 3900.

CMT

CMT
July 2, 2000

Gail Hayes

GAIL O. HAYES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700